

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,458	03/19/2004	Michael Tate Wood	C.R. Daniels-PA-6	7254
7590 06/13/2006			EXAMINER	
LAW OFFICES OF ROYAL W. CRAIG			POLLICOFF, STEVEN B	
Suite 153 10 North Calvert Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Baltimore, MD 21202			3728	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•		e
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/804,458	WOOD ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven B. Pollicoff	3728	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence ad	dress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a nd will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO ute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this contained by the contain	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ The 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal ma		merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 September 2004 is Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the least or the second	s/are: a) accepted or b) the drawing(s) be held in abeya the drawing if the drawin	nnce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CF	FR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreignal All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. nts have been received in a light in the ligh	Application No n received in this National	Stage

Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. 6) Other: ____.

Art Unit: 3728

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The use of the trademark <u>VELCRO</u> has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears (see the Specification and Claim 2) and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1,3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "integral liner" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination purposes examiner interprets the term to refer to the padded inner liner introduced in line 2.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "padded inner liner fabric" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination purposes examiner interprets the term to refer to the padded inner liner introduced in claim 1, line 2.

Art Unit: 3728

Claim 4 recites the limitation "patterned outer shell fabric" and "inner liner fabric" in lines 1 and 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. For examination purposes examiner interprets the terms to refer to the fabric outer shell and padded inner liner introduced in claim 1, line 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolpin (US Pat 2,901,018) in view of Jones et al., (US Pat 6,256,922).

With respect to claims 1 and 2, Kolpin discloses a firearms case comprising a fabric enclosure (Kolpin column 1 lines 59-61; i.e. canvas) having a fabric outer shell (Fig 1 reference number 22) sewn to a padded inner liner (Fig 2 reference number 24), reinforced around a peripheral seam (Fig 1 reference number 20). Kolpin also discloses

Art Unit: 3728

that the shell and integral liner are folded lengthwise (Fig 1) and sewn together at one end (20) to form an elongate enclosure closed along one side (12; the rubber bumper forms the closed one side) and said end. The enclosure also has an end access opening (16) selectively closeable with a fold over flap. Kolpin does not disclose that the enlongate enclosure closed along said side and said end has a sidelong access opening selectively closable with a fold over flap attached by velcro conjoined to the end access opening. Kolpin also does not disclose that the fold over flap of the end access opening is attached by velcro. However, Jones discloses a firearms case with an end access opening (Jones Fig 1 reference number 110) and a conjoined sidelong access opening (100) both with Velcro closures (Fig 7 reference number 160) attached. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the case of Kolpin to include a side access opening and Velcro closures, as taught by Jones, for the purpose of easier encasing firearms of various sizes (Jones column 2 lines 29-30).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolpin (US Pat 2,901,018) and Jones et al., (US Pat 6,256,922) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Binney (US Pat 4,257,464).

With respect to claim 3, Kolpin as modified above does not disclose that the inner liner fabric includes a rust preventative to inhibit corrosion of a gun stored therein.

However, Binney discloses a liner including a woven facing that is impregnated with a rust preventative to inhibit corrosion of a gun stored therein (column 1, lines 37-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 3728

invention was made to modify the inner liner fabric of Kolpin as modified by impregnating the inner liner with the rust preventative of Binney for the purpose of preventing rusting, corrosion, and pitting of the metal parts (column 1, lines 44-48).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolpin (US Pat 2,901,018) and Jones et al., (US Pat 6,256,922) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Broun et al., (US Pat 5,431,970).

With respect to claim 4, Kolpin as modified above does not disclose that the case further comprises padding between the outer shell fabric and the inner liner fabric.

However, Broun discloses a tri-layer protective material for cases (including gun cases; see Broun Fig 3B) where the middle layer (Broun Fig 1B reference number 14) is made of foam (i.e. padding) to protect again impact and abrasion of the contents held within.

The padding also provides floatation should the case be dropped in water (column 4, lines 49-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to at the time the invention was made to provide a middle padding layer, as taught by Broun, to the case of Kolpin as modified to further protect the contents against breakage or scratching from dropping and ordinary use and to provide floatation should the case inadvertently end up in water.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bennett (US Pub 2003/0106819) discloses a gun storage case with Velcro closure.

Application/Control Number: 10/804,458 Page 6

Art Unit: 3728

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. Pollicoff whose telephone number is (571)272-7818. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30A.M.-4:00P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on (571)272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

4188 6/07/06

JILA M. MOHANDESI PRIMARY EXAMINER